

## **LIVERPOOL DESIGN EXCELLENCE PANEL**

**Property:** 28 Shepherd Street, Liverpool

**Application Number:** DA-612/2015

### **Panel Members Present**

Helen Lochhead

Russell Olsson

Kim Crestani

Geoff Baker

### **Assessing Officer**

Nabila Samadie

### **Officers in Attendance**

Nabila Samadie

### **Applicants Name and / or Representatives:**

Joe Nahas – Coronation Property

Emily Raleigh – Coronation Property

Richard Weinman – Woods Bagot

Hannah Ko – Woods Bagot

Natalie Bernuetz – Aspect Studios

Kate Bartlett - Mecone

**Date of Meeting:** 20 August 2015

**Item Number:** 4

### **Chair**

Helen Lochhead

### **Convenor**

Lina Kakish

---

## **GENERAL INFORMATION**

The Liverpool Design Excellence Panel (the Panel), comments are to assist Liverpool City Council in its consideration of the development application.

The absence of a comment under any of the principles does not necessarily imply that the Panel considers the particular matter has been satisfactorily addressed, as it may be that changes suggested under other principles will generate a desirable change.

The 9 design quality principles will be grouped together where relevant, to avoid the unnecessary repetition of comments.

## PROPOSAL

The proposed development at 28 Shepherd Street, Liverpool is for a residential flat building comprising of 1 x 6 storey building with 66 apartments and 1 x 9 storey building with 103 apartments, underground car parking, demolition of structures and site works

The proposal has not been before the Panel previously.

## PANEL COMMENTS

The 9 design principles were considered by the panel in discussion of the development application. These are **1] Context, 2] Built Form + Scale 3] Density 4] Sustainability 5] Landscape 6] Amenity, 7] Safety 8] Housing Diversity +Social Interaction 9] Aesthetics.**

The Design Excellence Panel makes the following comments in relation to the project:

The architectural design, composition, materials of the external elevations and communal roof terraces are well considered, however the development cannot be supported in its current form for the following reasons:

- The development exceeds the maximum height limit as required by the LLEP 2008
- Whilst it is acknowledged that there is no merit based assessment for height limit i.e. heritage incentives as per the adjoining site, the panel would consider that the additional height may be acceptable provided compliance with the ADG are met and a VPA may be entered into to incorporate a public through site link to the River.
- The Panel acknowledges the setback to the riparian corridor on this site, however the riverfront building alignment may be adjusted to improve separation between the built forms
- The lack of soft landscaping in the proposed through site link is undesirable, and a potential safety issue for pedestrians with vehicles exiting the basement carpark– It is recommended that the driveway is de-coupled from the through site link and accommodated under the building footprint. The loading dock would also need relocation. A well landscaped pedestrian through site link should be incorporated in the subject site.
- The development does not meet the requirements of SEPP 65 and the Apartment Design Guide in a number of areas notably:
  - Solar access is not compliant i.e. 70% of units receiving two hours of sunlight
  - Inadequate deep soil, provision needs to be made for additional deep soil
  - Inboard habitable rooms – indicated as media rooms, have the potential to be turned into bedrooms. These rooms are not acceptable and should be deleted from the plans.

Other considerations may include:

- Reallocation of floor space between two buildings and adjustment of height to meet council standards or assess the merits of a VPA to justify height increase.
- The basement carpark occupies almost the entire site, Design of basement carpark over 2+ levels to increase deep soil onsite is recommended
- External façade treatment and architectural features are acceptable.

- An amended design is required to focus on addressing non-compliances with the LLEP and SEPP 65/ADG.

In the event that amended plans are submitted to Council to address the concerns of the Design Excellence Advisory Panel the amended plans should be referred back to the Panel for comment.

---

28 SHEPHERD STREET LIVERPOOL NSW

Development Application

Revisions

1 October 2015

RESPONSE TO FEEDBACK FROM DESIGN EXCELLENCE PANEL

Item	Feedback	Response
1	The development exceeds the maximum height limit as required by the LLEP 2008.	The original DA design proposed a distribution of density by the placement of a 6-storey building along Shepherd Street and a taller 9-storey building facing the Georges River. Building C2 's lower scale and double height articulation of ground level townhouse apartments activates the ground plane and relates to the street character established by the existing heritage Mills building located on 20 Shepherd Street. Building C1's increased height and placement that is parallel with the the river embankment allows for the maximum enjoyment of natural views. However, to address the Panel's comment, the design has been tested to exchange the heights between the two buildings. The test showed that the added residential levels on Building C2 oriented residential units towards unpleasant views to the passenger and freight rail ways and the potential for increased adverse acoustic impact. Furthermore, a taller Building C2 contrasted too significantly with the lower scale character of Shepherd Street. As a result of this study, the new design retains the current height of Building C2 but removes two full floors of residential apartments on Building C1. The amended Building C1 shows a height of 23.56m to the top of the parapet measured from the average of high and low points of the site. Its height to the top of the lift overrun in 27.26m measured from the average of high and low points of the site.
2	Whilst it is acknowledged that there is no merit based assessment for height limit ie. heritage incentives as per the adjoining site, the panel would consider that the additional may be acceptable provide compliance with the ADG are met and a VPA may be entered into to incorporate a public through site to the River.	Please refer Item 1 in this table. Additionally, a VPA will be provided by Coronation.
3	The Panel acknowledges the setback to the riparian corridor on this site, however, the riverfront building alignment may be adjusted to improve separation between the built forms.	The NSW water authorities have requested that the development does not encorach into the foreshore building line and riparian corridor on this site. Therefore, the new design has shifted both buildings to align as closely as possible to the development's site boundary on the west. Building C1 was shifted slightly further to clear the zone of the foreshore building line and riparian corridor. As a consequence, the separation between the two buildings have been reduced. To ompitimise the greatest building separation as possible, the new design has also reduced the depths of all private terraces and balconies to be a minimum of 2m clear.
4	The lack of soft landscaping in the proposed through site link is undeseriable, and a potential safety issue for pedestrians with vehicles exiting the basement carpark. It is recommended that the driveway is de-coupled from the through-site link and accommodated under the building footprint. The loading dock would also need relocation. A well landscaped pedestrian through-site link should be incorporated in the subject site.	Pedestrian safety has been improved in the development by relocating the basement carpark entry closer to the street and therefore minimising the potential for pedestrian and vehicular clash. There is also the potential for additional width for the laneway to be provided from the development of the neighbouring property. This additional width would enable street tree planting and dedicated footpaths to one or both sides of the laneway, further increasing safety and amenity. The Panel suggested that the loading dock be relocated rather than the driveway but as the use of the loading occur at a significantly lower intervals than the use of the car park entry, the car park entry was relocated.
5	Solar access is not compliant ie. 70% of units receiving two hours of sunlight.	The original DA design achieved 60% solar access on 21 June as a result of maintaining a level of harmony between 2 hours of sunlight during the mid winter while also optimising river views which are directly opposite to the north orientation. The new design has integrated additional slots in the external side walls to yield additional solar compliance. The new design achieves 62% solar access on 21 June between the hours of 9am and 3pm.
6	Inadequate deep soil, provision needs to be made for additional deep soil.	The extent of the basement levels have been significantly reduced. The new design achieves 17% deep soil.
7	Inboard habitable rooms - indicated as media rooms, have the potential to be turned into bedrooms. These rooms are not acceptable and should be deleted from the plans.	In the new design, where possible, media rooms have been provided with high level windows for natural ventilation. As open plan spaces allow the impression of greater space in apartment living, the integration of media rooms provides an added benefit for individuals and families who want informal use for watching television or listening to music separate from the activity of the kitchen and living areas. Where windows are not possible, the new design has removed all media rooms and realigned walls to provide open study areas with fixed desks and/or storage units.
8	Relallocation of floor space between two buildings and adjustment of height to meet council standards or assess the merits of a VPA to justify height increase.	Please refer to item 1 in this table.
9	The basement carpark occupies almost the entire site, Design of basement carpark over 2+ levels to increase deep soil onsite is recommended.	The extent of the basement levels have been significantly reduced to increase deep soil (refer to Item 7 in this table). As a result, the new design proposes an additional half level of basement to provide the required number of car spaces for the development.
10	External façade treatment and architectural features are acceptable.	The new design retains the external façade treatment and architectural features.
11	An amended design required to focus on addressing non-compliances with the LLEP and SEPP 65/ADG.	An amended design addressing the non-compliances with the LLEP and SEPP 65/ADG has been submitted to Council on 30 September 2015.